

**From:** "jschultz@insurinc.com%inter2" <jschultz@insurinc.com>  
**Subject:** Farm Bill 2007 Official Comments - 09/15/2005 04:21 PM CDT  
**Date Sent:** 09/15/2005 04:21:46 CDT  
**Date Received:** 09/15/2005 04:23:19 CDT

---

Email: jschultz@insurinc.com

FirstName: Jeff

LastName: Schultz

Address1: Box 384

Address2:

City: Doniphan

State: Nebraska

zipcode: 68832

Question1: The fault should not be on land prices but on what revenue is brought off of the land. Land values drive property taxes, banks interest income and many other important issues.

Question2: We sell irrigation equipment, seed, fertilizer and farm equipment international everyday which creates many jobs in the United States but then we tell our farmers we have to keep prices down to compete is like doubletalk. The farm export profit numbers brought into the United States should also include farm machinery, seed, fertilizer and other products that are exported. If we would not let our manufacturers export our prices for grain would be very high but no one has ever made this point.

Question3: Current programs are leading to the distruction of Agriculture as we know it. We need to consider changes in the whole program. I realize that there is no easy answer to the problems, but I would like to give you an idea (outside of the box).

Input prices go up every year but our prices do not and we have no way to control what price we sell for. Our only chance to make a profit is to grow more bushels which drives up input costs and increases risk.

There are more services with information on yield estimates, on farm stored grain numbers and other information used against the farmer who is trying to market his grain for a profit. We now have a FSA loan price on grain and if you watch grain markets when buyers need physical grain the price always go above loan price so the farmer will sell. Why don't we increase the loan price to \$2.35 etc. and elimiate subsidy payments. The farmer will sell if he knows he can be profitable and the cost of subsidy program will not be a burden to the government. The subsidy payments now get our price to close to that level anyway and then the market will then have to pay the price for the corn. This will eliminate subsidy payments as we know them. We also need to change when loans on grain are due. The market knows how much grain is on loan and when loans are due which in turn drives prices down knowing that farmers will have to surrender the grain to the government at the end of the loan period or sell it for a loss. We need to make it harder for the board of trade to control the markets. The loan prices should at least go up according to whatever the government says the inflation rate is.

They should not just stay flat. We have the highest cattle prices, ethonal is booming but yet the farmers are at the mercy of the goverment. The government in turn is blaming the farmer for the cost of the subsidy payments which is providing low grain prices. I would like to see the subsidy program shifted to the ethonal and cattle feeders and other grian users in case the grain prices get too high and they can't be profitable. (what a good problem that would be.) I feel that most industries would figure out a way to be profitable. The current program is leading us down a path that in 10 years you will see many farmers retire and we will eventually have a small number of large farmers who will then make deals with suppliers and marketers and a lot of ag businesses will be driven out of business. This will eventually get

commodity prices to the level they should now be at but this in turn will create new problems in trying to control the big farms in conjunction with oil companies (who already own most seed, fertilizer and chemical companies) from controlling the grain prices. If the burden of the commodity prices would be shifted to the buyers they will have the opportunity like any other business man to pass the increase on to the next buyer. This is what economics is all about.

Question4: I have no problem with this but it should be fair. We just had a new NRD program introduced to promote good farming practices in our area. Many farmers did not even sign up but we are minimum till and the NRD employees were exited with our farming practices and told us we will qualify. We have 120 acres that a landlord owns and there is not a pivot on this ground, because this ground is not minimum till we were eliminated from the program on the other 820 acres that we are doing everything right. To punish will not promote stewardship.

Question5: I think if the farmers were once again profitable that everything would take care of itself. I grew up by a town of 200 people. We had a thriving community when I was younger but farmers have been forced to eliminated hired help and farms got bigger because they had to. The only farmers left are landowners from way back. The more farmers that can make a profit the more they buy, the more help they hire and the better the economy gets. I personally would not work two jobs, so one good job would be created by just letting the farmer make a profit.

Question6: I do think we have to expand markets because as we help develop other countries to drive manufacturing the more we hurt ourselves. We need to figure out how to utilize our greatest resources that are renewable every year.